REMARKS

This Amendment is filed in response to the Office action dated March 21, 2008. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections presented therein. All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 – 33 are pending in this case.

Claims 1, 13, 22 and 28 have been amended.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

At paragraphs 8 – 26 of the Office Action, claims 1 – 4, 7, 9 – 15, 18, 20 – 25, 28 – 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Henderson et al., U.S. Publication No. 2004/004290, published March 4, 2004 (hereinafter "Henderson").

Applicant's claim 1, representative in part of claims 1 – 4, 7, 9 – 15, 18, 20 – 25, 28 – 31, sets forth (emphasis added):

> 1.   A method for modifying data transferred from a source to a destination, the method comprising the steps of:
>   reading one or more instructions, by a processor, each instruction indicating an operation to modify the data;
>   generating, in response to the one or more instructions, one or more commands wherein each command is associated with the operation to modify the data;
>   placing the commands in a data structure;
>   *initiating transfer of data from the source to the destination*; and
>   *performing*, by a device operating independently from the processor, *the operations associated with the commands* contained in the data structure *to modify the data* as directed by the commands *while the data is being transferred from the source to the destination*.

Henderson discloses a system and method for modifying received packets. Specifically, a "packet input unit 210 notifies [a] packet processing controller 200 that a new packet is being received." *See* paragraph 0030. Under the direction of the packet process-

11

ing controller (200), an editing unit (216) modifies the packet. *See* paragraph 0034. A queue operation unit (218) orders packets for output "once the editing unit 216 has processed the packets." *See* paragraph 0035. "Once scheduled, the packet output unit 222 retrieves the packets from cache and outputs them from the services processor 110." *See* paragraph 0036.

Stated Succinctly, Henderson first edits packets, then scheduled them, and then transmits them to a destination (i.e., the output unit 222).

Applicant respectfully urges that Henderson fails to teach or suggest Applicant's claimed novel *"performing… the operations associated with the commands… to modify the data… <u>while</u> the data is transferred from the source to the destination."*

Applicant claims a technique where commands, associated with operations that modify the data, are placed in a data structure. The operations associated with the commands modify the data **WHILE** the data is in the process of being transferred from the source to the destination.

In contrast, Henderson's data packets are **NOT** modified while the packets are in the process of being transferred from a source to a destination. Instead, the packets in Henderson are modified **BEFORE** a transfer of the packets to a destination is initiated. Specifically, an editing unit 216 is responsible for packet editing. *See* paragraph 0034. Once the edits have been performed for a particular packet, the packet is retrieved by the queue operation unit 218 that handles the ordering of packets before they are output. *See* paragraph 0035. The queue operation unit 218 is coupled to the cache 230 to prepare the data for output and maintains the queues in cache 230. *See* paragraph 0035. Output scheduler 220 then schedules the packet and "[o]nce scheduled, the packet output unit 222 retrieves the packet from cache and outputs them from the services processor 110." *See* paragraph 0036. Therefore, <u>output unit 222 (a destination) retrieves the packet once the packets have been scheduled, and the packets are not scheduled until the packets have been completely edited</u>. As such, Henderson **does not** teach or suggest performing operations to modify packets **while** the packets are being transferred to the output unit.

Accordingly, for the above reasons, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and urges that Henderson is legally insufficient to anticipate the present claims under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

At paragraphs 27 – 30 of the Office Action, claims 5, 16, 26, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henderson in view of Ueno, U.S. Publication No. 2002/0009050 (hereinafter "Ueno").

Applicant respectfully notes that claims 5, 16, 26, and 32 are dependent claims that depend from independent claims that are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, claims 5, 16, 26, and 32 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

At paragraphs 27 and 31 – 33 of the Office Action, claims 8 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henderson in view of Deforche et al., U.S. Publication No. 2005/0232303 (hereinafter "Deforche").

Applicant respectfully notes that claims 8 and 19 are dependent claims that depend from independent claims that are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, claims 9 and 19 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner believe a telephonic interview would be helpful in the disposition of this Application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned attorney at (617) 951-2500.

In summary, all the independent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance and therefore all dependent claims that depend there from are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Please charge any additional fee occasioned by this paper to our Deposit Account No. 03-1237.

Respectfully submitted,

_/James A. Blanchette/_____
James A. Blanchette
Reg. No. 51,477
CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP
88 Black Falcon Avenue
Boston, MA 02210-2414
(617) 951-2500